

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/668,745	09/23/2003	David W. Boggs	884.942US1	1789	
21186	7590 11/17/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.			DINH, T	DINH, TUAN T	
P.O. BOX 293 MINNEAPOL	8 .IS, MN 55402		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	,	•	2841		
		DATE MAILED: 11/17/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/668,745	BOGGS ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Tuan T. Dinh	2841			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timustill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE.	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. 8.133)			
Status						
2a)□	 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 October 2006</u>. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati 9)□	Claim(s) 1-20 and 28-33 is/are pending in the address of the above claim(s) 17-20 is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-16,28-33 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examinet	r election requirement.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice (3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	ite			

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/31/06 has been entered.

Note of claimed language:

Examiner is considered the term "<u>adapted to</u>" as well as defined as <u>an intended</u> <u>use limitation</u>. The claim limitation, that employ phrases of the type "adapted to" is typical of claim limitation, which may not distinguish over prior art according to the principle. It has been held that the recitation that <u>an element is "adapted to" perform or is "capable of" performing a function is not a positive limitation</u> but only requires the ability to so perform, see In re Venezia, 189 USPQ 149 (CCPA 1976).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/668,745

Art Unit: 2841

21."

2. Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification is lack to support the limitation of "the test apparatus under the control of the processor, claim 10, lines 20-

Page 3

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 10, 20-21, it is confuse. The phrase of "the test apparatus under the control of the processor" is not understood because the test apparatus, which is external test device, the test apparatus tests inter-layers of the multilayer circuit board having a processor (see figure 1), the processor (CPU) is main component mounted on the PCB having main function to operate or control data of another components on the PCB, so how can the tester being control by the CPU, it is contradiction, please, clarify.

By applying art, the examiner assumes that "the tester or test apparatus used to test the through hole."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1-9 and 28-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiraki (U.S. Patent 6,969,808) in view of Ott et al. (U.S. Patent 6,147,505).

As to claims 1-5, 7-9, Shiraki discloses a device, which is a semiconductor chip or a multilayer circuit board (column 1, lines 16-17, claims 7-8) as shown in figures 1-4 comprising:

first and second major exterior surfaces (top and bottom surfaces of the board, see figure 2), at least one of the first and second major exterior surfaces including a plurality of component mounting pads (not label, but the pads are formed on the first surface of the multilayer circuit board);

a signal (31) carrying plated through hole (plated hole 21) terminating at the at least one the first or second major exterior surfaces; a pad (top and bottom portion of the plated 21) and the signal carrying connected to the pad, an ant-ipad (clearance hole formed between the ground layer and the pad) substantially surround the pad

a plane metallization layer, which is power, ground, or reference voltage planes (26-ground layer, 27-power layer, column 3, lines 35-36, claims 2-4) within the device surround the pad and anti-pad (see figure 9); and a plated through hole or via (41, column 3, line 41) attached to the plane metallization layer (26 or 27) and terminating at

the at least one of the first and second major exterior surfaces including the plurality of component mounting pads, the plated through hole (41) electrically isolated from the plurality of component mounting pads, and a signal through hole (21) having a signal layer (11) passed through the plane metallization layer (26; 27) and terminated at the pad at the first surface (claim 5).

Shiraki does not specific disclose <u>a circuit tester</u> to test the spacing of a plane metallization layer from the signal through hole that passes through the plane metallization layer.

Ott et al. teaches an adapter arrangement for electrically testing printed circuit board as shown in figures 1a-1d comprising a tester (10) having probes (9) tested on pads and through holes of the PCB.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a teaching of Ott et al. employed in the device of Shiraki in order to prevent an internal short circuit.

As to claim 6, Shiraki discloses the signal (signal layer 11 connected to the through hole 21) carrying plated through hole (21), which passes though and electrically isolates the plane metallization layer (26; 27) and is connected to the pad at the first major exterior surface.

As to claims 28-33, Shiraki discloses a device (PCB) as shown in figures 1-4 comprising:

first and second major exterior surfaces (top and bottom surfaces of the board, see figure 2), at least one of the first and second major exterior surfaces including a

plurality of component mounting pads (not label, but the pads are formed on the first surface of the multilayer circuit board);

a feature, which is a trace or signal layer (11) or a signal carrying through hole (21) positioned within the device;

a plane metallization layer (26-ground layer, 27-power layer, column 3, lines 35-36, claims 2-4) within the device; and a plated through hole (41, column 3, line 41) attached to the plane metallization layer (26 or 27) and terminating at the at least one of the first and second major exterior surfaces including the plurality of component mounting pads, the plated through hole (41) electrically isolated from the pads, and the feature or signal layer (11) passed through and isolates the plane metallization layer (26; 27) and terminated at the pad at the first surface (claim 5).

Shiraki does not disclose the test device having a probe tested on the PCB/device.

Ott et al. teaches an adapter arrangement for electrically testing printed circuit board as shown in figures 1a-1d comprising a tester (10) having probes (9) tested on pads and through holes of the PCB.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a teaching of Ott et al. employed in the device of Shiraki in order to prevent an internal short circuit.

7. Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiraki ('808) in view of Conn et al. (U.S. Patent 5,418,690), and further in view of Ott et al. (U.S. Patent 6,147,505).

As to claims 10-15, Shiraki discloses a device, which is a semiconductor chip or a multilayer circuit board (column 1, lines 16-17, claims 11-12) as shown in figures 1-4 comprising:

first and second major exterior surfaces (top and bottom surfaces of the board, see figure 2), at least one of the first and second major exterior surfaces including a plurality of component mounting pads (not label, but the pads are formed on the first surface of the multilayer circuit board);

a plane metallization layer, which is power, ground, or reference voltage planes (26-ground layer, 27-power layer, column 3, lines 35-36, claims 13-15) within the device; and

a plated through hole (41, column 3, line 41) attached to the plane metallization layer (26 or 27) and terminating at the at least one of the first and second major exterior surfaces including the plurality of component mounting pads, the plated through hole (41) electrically isolated from the plurality of component mounting pads, and a signal through hole (21) (a signal layer (11) connected to the through hole 21) passed through and spaced away the plane metallization layer (26; 27) and attached at the pad at the first surface (claim 5).

Shraki does not specific disclose a processor, a memory, and the device associated with at least one of the processor and memory.

Conn et al. shows a printed circuit board (PCB 10-figure 1 and 31-figure 4) comprising a processor (11) and a memory chip (12; 13) mounted on the PCB.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a teaching of Conn et al. employed in the device of Shiraki in order to provide a function as operator programs or applications and store data in a computer system.

Shiraki and Conn et al. do not disclose the signal through hole (21) connected to a test apparatus.

Ott et al. teaches an adapter arrangement for electrically testing printed circuit board as shown in figures 1a-1d comprising a tester (10) having probes (9) tested on pads and through holes of the PCB.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a teaching of Ott et al. employed in the device of Shiraki and Conn et al. in order to prevent an internal short circuit.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15, and 28-33 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues

The combination of Shiraki and Ott fails to teach or suggest all elements of claim 1 because Shiraki does not disclose the pad connected to a signal carrying through hole, and the plane metallization layer substantially surrounds the pad and an anti-pad.

Examiner disagrees because as shown in figure 9 of Shiraki, the reference disclose the pad (not label) but the top and bottom portions of the plated through hole (21) having signal layer (31) connected that is defined as the pad, and the anti-pad (clearance hole surround the pad) having a ground layer substantially surround the anti-pad and pad, see figure 9. Thus, the combination is proper.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan T. Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-1929. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Enad Elvin can be reached on 571-272-1990. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/668,745

Art Unit: 2841

Page 10

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tuan Druh.

Tuan Dinh November 10, 2006.